

Message

---

**From:** Newhouse, Kathleen [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=5F019C8179304045ACD61BC05B571FB0-NEWHOUSE, KATHLEEN]  
**Sent:** 11/30/2016 9:54:42 PM  
**To:** Dishaw, Laura [Dishaw.Laura@epa.gov]; Luke, April [Luke.April@epa.gov]  
**CC:** Rieth, Susan [Rieth.Susan@epa.gov]  
**Subject:** Examples of List of Issues for ERC reviewers  
**Attachments:** Ammonia\_Major Revisions in Response to SAB\_4-14-16.docx; Formaldehyde\_Issues raised for ERC Issues\_May2016.docx; ERC Queries Feb16.docx; Issues for BaP ERC review-8-19-16 (002).docx

In case this helps, attached are the ERC lists of issues for BaP, ammonia, formaldehyde, and n-butanol. We don't have a standard format, so there is flexibility there.

-K

---

**From:** Jones, Samantha  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 06, 2016 12:22 PM  
**To:** Perovich, Gina <Perovich.Gina@epa.gov>; Subramaniam, Ravi <Subramaniam.Ravi@epa.gov>; Newhouse, Kathleen <Newhouse.Kathleen@epa.gov>  
**Cc:** Cogliano, Vincent <cogliano.vincent@epa.gov>; Soto, Vicki <Soto.Vicki@epa.gov>; Shams, Dahnish <Shams.Dahnish@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: BaP

Hi all,

As I've mentioned several times in Roundtable and Division Director meetings, I need information on the chemical assessment science and science policy issues to be reviewed and discussed by the ERC in order to efficiently set up the ERC review (see attached examples, you may want to follow ammonia since that was in the same stage you are but I'd guess your issues are more substantive than theirs). It is best if this information is provided to me well in advance of the initiation of ERC so that I have reviewers lined up when I receive the draft assessment. You can submit the draft to me tomorrow but it will take time for me to line up the appropriate reviewers (this eats into your 28 days you've allotted for review).

If you can provide the major issues that warrant ERC review and discussion and highlight the particular areas of expertise you would find useful as soon as possible, that will go a long way.

Additionally, the Nov 17<sup>th</sup> ERC check-in should be replaced with IRIS Program review with major issues being highlighted and shared with NCEA (we can talk about how this could be done, depending on the issues that arise).

On a specific note, I highly recommend the use of mark-up meetings and group approaches to getting the non-ERC reviews and the revisions done to help with the tight timeline. I can do what I can with some heads up to make the ERC review go as efficiently as possible.

Thanks,  
Samantha

Samantha J. Jones, Ph.D  
Acting Associate Director for Health, ORD/NCEA  
Phone: (703) 347-8580

---

**From:** Perovich, Gina

**Sent:** Wednesday, July 06, 2016 2:29 PM

**To:** Subramaniam, Ravi <[Subramaniam.Ravi@epa.gov](mailto:Subramaniam.Ravi@epa.gov)>; Newhouse, Kathleen <[Newhouse.Kathleen@epa.gov](mailto:Newhouse.Kathleen@epa.gov)>

**Cc:** Cogliano, Vincent <[cogliano.vincent@epa.gov](mailto:cogliano.vincent@epa.gov)>; Jones, Samantha <[Jones.Samantha@epa.gov](mailto:Jones.Samantha@epa.gov)>; Soto, Vicki <[Soto.Vicki@epa.gov](mailto:Soto.Vicki@epa.gov)>; Shams, Dahnish <[Shams.Dahnish@epa.gov](mailto:Shams.Dahnish@epa.gov)>

**Subject:** BaP

Hi – BaP was slated to begin ERC review tomorrow.

I know pieces were submitted to Vince for review.

Where are we on this?

Has it been reviewed in its entirety yet?

Can it be submitted to ERC tomorrow?

Thx.

Gina

## Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

---

Gina Perovich

Deputy Director, IRIS Program

National Center for Environmental Assessment

Office of Research and Development

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

phone: (703) 347-8656

fax: (703) 347-8689